DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 184 EA 030 430

TITLE	Retention and Attrition of Pacific School Teachers and Administrators (RAPSTA) Study: Yap State, Federated States of Micronesia. Research Series.
INSTITUTION	Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, Honolulu, HI.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-06-00
NOTE	35p.; For similar study on Chuuk State, Guam, and Yap state, see EA 030 427; EA 030 428, and EA 030 429, respectively.
CONTRACT	RJ96006601
AVAILABLE FROM	Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, Suite 2500, 1099 Alakea Street, Honolulu, HI 96813 (RS9804). Tel: 808-533-6000; e-mail: askprel@prel.hawaii.edu; Web site: http://www.prel.hawaii.edu.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; Government Publications; *Job Satisfaction; *Labor Turnover; *Morale; Public Schools; Questionnaires; *Stress Variables; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Burnout
IDENTIFIERS	*Federated States of Micronesia (Yap)

ABSTRACT

Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL) works closely with 10 American-affiliated Pacific entities: (1) American Samoa; (2) the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands; (3) the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, Yap); (4) Guam; (5) Hawaii; (6) the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and (7) the Republic of Palau. The survey raises awareness of the risk factors affecting educators in the Pacific entities served by PREL and provides insight necessary to redress the concerns of students, policymakers and educators. This study identified risk factors affecting educators in Yap State. These risk factors might also play a role in teachers' and school administrators' absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout. In Yap, 189 teacher surveys and 26 administrator surveys were returned. Absenteeism among teachers and administrators appears to be a problem; they cited personal illness and funerals, educational leave, meetings and workshops as reasons. Among teachers, reasons for leaving teaching include low salaries and too many responsibilities. Reasons for school administrators to leave could not be determined from this analysis. The data collected in the study reveal the extent of these problems and shed some light on possible contributing factors. Appendixes contain teacher and administrator questionnaires. (Contains 17 references.) (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 184

RETENTION AND ATTRITION OF PACIFIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS (RAPSTA) STUDY

Yap State, Federated States of Micronesia

Research and Development Cadre

June 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PREL PACIFIC RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

EA 030430

RESEARCH SERIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



RETENTION AND ATTRITION OF PACIFIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS (RAPSTA) STUDY

Yap State, Federated States of Micronesia

Research and Development Cadre

June 1998

PACIFIC RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING
828 Fort Street Mall • Suite 500 • Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813
Tel: (808) 533-6000 • e-mail: askprel@prel.hawaii.edu
WEBsite: http://www.prel.hawaii.edu

This publication was produced with funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006601. The content does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iii

Preface iv

I. Introduction 1

II. Methods 3

III. Findings 7

IV. Discussion 11

V. Limitations 12

VI. Recommendations 14

References 15

Appendices 17

List of Tables

1. Characteristics of RAPSTA Teacher Sample from Yap State 4

2. Characteristics of RAPSTA School Administrator Sample from Yap State 4

3. Reasons Why Teachers Are Away from School in Yap State 7

4. Reasons Why School Administrators Are Away from School in Yap State 7

5. Reasons for Leaving Teaching in Yap State 8

6. Reasons for Leaving School Administration in Yap State 9

7. MBI Subscale Mean Scores for Yap State Teachers and School Administrators Compared to the Norm Sample 9

8. Cut-Off Scores for MBI Subscale Categories 10

List of Figures

1. Personal accomplishment among teachers in Yap State 10

2. Emotional exhaustion among teachers in Yap State 10

3. Depersonalization among teachers in Yap State 10

4. Personal accomplishment among school administrators in Yap State 11

5. Emotional exhaustion among school administrators in Yap State 11

6. Depersonalization among school administrators in Yap State 11

Acknowledgments

This study could not have been completed without the support of departments and ministries of education in the Pacific region, the Research and Development (R&D) Cadre members, and their local R&D support teams. Contributions of time and resources in this cost-shared activity increased work responsibilities and strained small budgets. Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL) staff who worked on this study–Zoe Ann Brown, Jennifer Crites, Stan Koki, Larissa Leroux, Rodrigo Mauricio, Denise Onikama, Carol Perry, Liane Sing, and Kyaw Soe–are grateful to R&D Cadre members for their commitment to the work, and for the continuing support of the region's chief state school officers and the education chief of the FSM National Government.

PREL particularly appreciates the work of R&D Cadre member Timothy Mo'on, Yap Department of Education, for his guidance and leadership in carrying out this research in Yap State. His efforts, along with those of the Yap State local R&D support team–Pius Talimeisei, Melissa Mendoca, Fidelia Adgil, Gilmoon, and Ferdinand Samot–made this study possible.

PREL R&D Cadre Members, 1996-1998

Faauma Seui	American Samoa
Sina Peau Ward	American Samoa
Peter James	Chuuk State, FSM
Eric Marar	Chuuk State, FSM
Jean Olopai	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Burnis Danis	Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)
Nerissa Bretania-Shafer	Guam
Leilani Nishimura	Guam
Michael Heim	Hawai'i
Winton Clarence	Kosrae State, FSM
Marilyn Kabua	Republic of the Marshall Islands
Edwel Ongrung	Republic of Palau
Masaharu Tmodrang	Republic of Palau
Hanover Ehsa	Pohnpei State, FSM
Timothy Mo'on	Yap State, FSM

Preface

This study represents one step towards solving problems that plague many schools throughout the Pacific: high rates of absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout among teachers and school administrators. The data collected in this study reveal the extent of these problems and shed some light on possible contributing factors.

During coming months, R&D Cadre members will present this report to teachers and school administrators in each Pacific entity, soliciting feedback and suggestions that we anticipate will lead to the formulation of specific, entity-based solutions to these concerns.

I. Introduction

The mission of Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL) is to *assist education, government, community agencies, businesses, and labor groups to maintain cultural literacy and improve the quality of life by helping to strengthen educational programs and processes for children, youth, and adults* (Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, 1996).

In order to carry out this mission, PREL has made a commitment to work in close partnership with the ten American-affiliated Pacific entities: American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, Yap), Guam, Hawai'i, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau. As a result of their very different forms of political affiliation with the United States, these ten states are referred to as *entities* in PREL's terminology.

As part of this work, PREL's Research and Development (R&D) Cadre has undertaken several studies in order to describe the educational experiences and opportunities of Pacific Islanders. The R&D Cadre is a group of Pacific educators consisting of one member from each department or ministry of education in the ten entities comprising PREL's service region, and one member representing the National Department of Education, Federated States of Micronesia.

Each entity has formed a local support team of researchers who assist the cadre member in carrying out research studies. The local R&D support teams range in size from five to thirteen members.

One of the studies conducted, *A Study of Risk Factors Among High School Students in the Pacific Region* (Pacific Region Educational Laboratory R&D Cadre, 1995), sparked interest in examining risk factors associated with adults working in Pacific schools. Open-ended questions answered by students participating in the 1995 study indicated that these students were concerned about teacher absenteeism. In entities where no substitute teacher pool is available, students' educational opportunities may be seriously compromised due to high rates of teacher absenteeism.

Frequent teacher absenteeism in the Pacific may have a strong impact on student achievement. For various reasons, such as lack of funds or human resources, substitute-teacher programs are lacking in many entities. Students might come to school, but a teacher might not be available to teach them. Not only does this affect access to educational opportunities and contribute to low student achievement, it could also have an effect on attendance counts, which can adversely affect school funding, thus perpetuating a negative cycle.

Factors related to teacher and school administrator absenteeism have been identified in research conducted in American schools. However, similar research is lacking for the Pacific region. As a result, the PREL Board of Directors recommended follow-up research detailing risk factors for teachers and school administrators. This recommendation was supported by the R&D Cadre members, who expressed interest in examining these risk factors within their respective entities. In addition, policy makers and program managers in the ten entities have expressed concern about the impact of teacher and administrator absenteeism, as well as attrition and stress/burnout, on student achievement.

In response to these concerns, a study was designed to describe the factors that affect Pacific Island educators and make them "at risk" for absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (1997) defines stress as "a physical, chemical, or emotional factor that causes bodily and mental tension." Research indicates that excessive stress might cause illness.

A condition termed "burnout" (DeRobbio, 1995) could also result from difficult and stressful work conditions. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines this condition as "exhaustion of physical or emotional strength."

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1) What are the risk factors that affect Pacific school teachers and administrators?

2) What risk factors lead to absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout?

The RAPSTA study comes at a time when the Yap Department of Education is examining its programs and structure. Of particular interest to Yap State is the need to develop school improvement strategies, such as determining ways to increase teacher and administrator preparation, within the context of Yap culture.

This study was designed to identify risk factors affecting educators in Yap State and other Pacific entities served by PREL. As part of the process, a literature review of teacher risk factors was performed and published (Hammond & Onikama, 1997). This review concluded that:

1) Factors associated with teacher absenteeism–such as child care, transportation difficulties, illness, and cultural demands–tend to be immediate obligations or concerns (Scott & Wimbush, 1991).

2) Factors associated with attrition–such as low salaries, poor benefits, and work overload–are chronic or habitual concerns (Wari, 1993).

3) Factors associated with stress/burnout–such as student misbehavior (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Pelletier, 1977; American Psychiatric Association, 1994); anger, anxiety, or depression (DeRobbio & Iwanicki, 1996); and school reform (Farber & Ascher, 1992)–are daily nuisances.

These risk factors might also play a role in teacher and school administrator absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout in the Pacific region with its unique educational, cultural, and geographical contexts. Pacific schools have adopted the American system of education. However, this transplanted system exists parallel to a Pacific orientation and heritage influenced by Polynesian and Micronesian traditional values, cultural events, and environmental circumstances. Some examples include the following, which were taken from a review of the literature and interviews with Pacific educators:

Cultural events. In some island communities, traditional feasts and funerals are important parts of village life. For instance, if a feast falls on a school day, it is likely that the teacher (who may hold a traditional title) will not go to school, but will prepare for the event. Family relationships with their attendant obligations are highly valued and honored among Pacific Islanders and may account for higher absenteeism rates among Pacific educators.

Family and village social roles. In many island communities, family and village relationships provide a social context that may overlook frequent absenteeism. For example, a teacher may be a member of a large and influential family, many of whom may be employed in the public school system. That teacher's absenteeism may, therefore, be overlooked. Although the traditional American ethic views such favoritism as inappropriate, it may be tolerated within the context of many Pacific lifestyles.

Culturally sanctioned time off. Culturally sanctioned time off may be granted to some people in some entities. One example is referred to as "Monday sickness," in which male teachers, especially those who are young and single, are absent from school after a weekend of excess. Their absence is tolerated as a social and developmental pattern related to their youth.

Environmental factors. Unique weather patterns such as hurricanes and "super-typhoons" in the Pacific region may have an effect on absenteeism. Typhoon Paka, for example, recently decimated Guam, leaving it without electricity and forcing the closure of schools. In Hawai'i, giant winter swells may close roadways and limit access to schools. Flooding in low-lying islands and atolls can cause many teachers to miss school for one or more days.

The main purpose of this study was to raise awareness of risk factors affecting educators in the Pacific entities and to provide insight necessary to address the concerns of students, policy makers, and educators throughout the region. Hopefully, the results will stimulate interest and follow-up action as it relates to local professional development opportunities for Pacific educators.

Because of the region's remote geographical location and its distance from educator training programs, as well as the high costs associated with traveling to institutions of higher education, local departments of education must share responsibility for the development of programs or interventions geared towards maintaining the educational work force. Preventing the negative outcomes associated with risk factors can help educators to become more effective while working with their students and thus promote positive student outcomes. The study will also contribute to the fund of knowledge on absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout among educators generally, and Pacific educators specifically, thereby contributing to cross-cultural theory building. This, in turn, may assist the development of models and tools for promoting retention and reducing attrition and stress/burnout among educators in the Pacific and elsewhere.

II. Methods

The *Retention and Attrition of Pacific School Teachers and Administrators* (RAPSTA) study was conducted in ten American-affiliated Pacific entities during the spring of 1997. It was designed and conducted by PREL's R&D Cadre and its members' local support teams. PREL staff provided technical assistance.

R&D Cadre members participated in three PREL-sponsored seminars where they acquired tools enabling them to design the study, develop data collection instruments, and analyze the data. Cadre members shared information and ideas from the seminars with their local R&D support team.

Subjects

The unit of analysis for this study is the elementary and secondary-level teacher and school administrator. Yap DOE wanted to survey its entire teacher and school administrator population. Two hundred and ninety-nine teacher surveys were distributed, and 189 completed surveys were returned, resulting in a 63 percent response rate. Thirty-four school administrator surveys were distributed, and 26 completed surveys were returned, resulting in a 76 percent response rate. Tables 1 and 2 summarize demographic characteristics of the subjects.

Table 1

Characteristics of RAPSTA Teacher Sample from Yap State

Demographic Characteristics		Number	Percentage
Gender	Female	68	36.0
	Male	106	56.1
	No Response	15	7.9
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Ethnicity	Caucasian	6	3.2
	Filipino	8	4.2
	Palauan	3	1.6
	Ulithian	20	10.6
	Woleaian	33	17.5
	Yapese	95	50.3
	Mixed Micronesian	5	2.6
	Other	2	1.1
	No Response	17	9.0
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Age	20-29	36	19.0
	30-39	62	32.8
	40-49	64	33.9
	50+	22	11.6
	No Response	5	2.6
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Marital Status	Never Married	40	21.2
	Married	125	66.1
	Separated	5	2.6
	Divorced	4	2.1
	Widowed	7	3.7
	No Response	8	4.2
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Education	HS Graduate	80	42.3
	Associate Degree	64	33.9
	Bachelor's Degree	17	9.0
	Master's Degree	8	4.2
	Other	7	3.7
	No Response	13	6.9
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Experience	1 - 4 Years	51	27.0
	5 - 10 Years	50	26.5
	11 - 14 Years	19	10.1
	15 - 20 Years	30	15.9
	20+ Years	28	14.8
	No Response	11	5.8
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**
Salary	<4,000	58	30.7
	4,000-4,999	12	6.3
	5,000-5,999	38	20.1
	6,000-6,999	40	21.2
	7,000-7,999	8	4.2
	8,000+	10	5.3
	No Response	23	12.2
	TOTAL	**189**	**100.0**

The majority of teachers are married Yapese males, between the ages of 30 and 49 years, with either a high school diploma (42.3%) or an associate degree (33.9%) and one to ten years of teaching experience.

Table 2

Characteristics of RAPSTA School Administrator Sample from Yap State

Demographic Characteristics		Number	Percentage
Gender	Female	3	11.5
	Male	22	84.6
	No Response	1	3.8
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Ethnicity	Carolinian	1	3.8
	Palauan	2	7.7
	Satawalese	1	3.8
	Ulithian	3	11.5
	Woleaian	4	15.4
	Yapese	12	46.2
	Other	1	3.8
	No Response	2	7.7
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Age	35-39	6	23.1
	40-44	4	15.4
	45-49	10	38.5
	50+	5	19.2
	No Response	1	3.8
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Marital Status	Never Married	6	23.1
	Married	16	61.5
	Separated	1	3.8
	Divorced	0	0.0
	Widowed	3	11.5
	No Response	0	0.0
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Education	HS Graduate	4	15.4
	Associate Degree	11	42.3
	Bachelor's Degree	8	30.8
	Master's Degree	1	3.8
	Other	2	7.7
	No Response	0	0.0
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Experience	1 - 4 Years	5	19.2
	5 - 10 Years	2	7.7
	11 - 14 Years	1	3.8
	15 - 20 Years	6	23.1
	20+ Years	12	46.2
	No Response	0	0.0
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**
Salary	5,000-5,999	6	23.1
	6,000-6,999	8	30.8
	7,000-7,999	1	3.8
	8,000+	10	38.5
	No Response	1	3.8
	TOTAL	**26**	**100.0**

Most school administrators are married Yapese males, between the ages of 45 and 49 years, with either an associate degree (42.3%) or a bachelor's degree (30.8%), and more than 15 years of experience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sampling

Because the Yap DOE wanted the study to include the entire teacher and administrator population, all 26 schools in Yap State were surveyed: 12 from Yap Island Proper, and 14 from the neighboring islands. The data set includes 112 teachers and 14 school administrators from Yap Proper, and 77 teachers and 12 school administrators from the neighboring islands.

Instrumentation

Two similar data collection instruments were developed, one for teachers and another for school administrators (see Appendices). Each is a five-page survey with three sections: Section 1 consists of 2-1/2 pages of forced-choice and short-answer, self-reported background information as well as absenteeism data for the school year in which the survey was administered. Section 2 is a single-page rating sheet outlining stress/burnout feelings; it was adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey and Human Services Survey (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Section 3 is also a single-page rating sheet detailing reasons why an educator might quit teaching or working as a school administrator. Individuals did not identify themselves by name, and all responses were kept confidential.

Section 1 - Demographic Characteristics and Absenteeism Data

Section 1 gathered relevant personal information to be used in examining teacher/school administrator retention and attrition. Questions asked about gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, educational attainment, salary, experience, and current teaching load. Additional data on the number of instructional days away from school during the 1996-1997 school year (SY) and the reasons for those absences were collected. For example, participants were asked to write down the number of days they were away from school in SY 1996-1997 for reasons such as funerals, birthdays, storms, heavy rains, or floods.

Section 2 - Stress and Burnout Ratings

The purpose of Section 2, as a means of measuring employee stress/burnout, was to discover how respondents view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is recognized as the leading measure of burnout. "It is the best known and most widely used questionnaire for the assessment of individual occupational burnout among human service workers and others whose work involves intense interaction with people" (Offerman, 1986, p. 419). The MBI is a 22-item, self-report inventory of three subscales, which were developed to measure dimensions that the authors felt best defined burnout. These subscales include Low Personal Accomplishment (8 items), Emotional Exhaustion (9 items), and Depersonalization (5 items).

- Low Personal Accomplishment results when teachers evaluate themselves negatively, particularly in relation to their work with students (DeRobbio, 1995). Those who report low personal accomplishment may disagree with the statement, "I have accomplished many worthwhile things in teaching" (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1986, p. 2).

- Emotional Exhaustion "is the tired and fatigued feeling that develops as emotional energies are drained. When these feelings become chronic, educators find they can no longer give of themselves to students as they once could" (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 28). They may agree with the statement, "I feel I'm working too hard on my job" (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 2).

- Depersonalization results when educators "no longer have positive feelings about their students" (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 28). They may develop negative or cynical attitudes and feelings about them and may agree with the statement, "I don't really care

what happens to some of my students" (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1986, p. 2).

Respondents rated each of the 22 items in terms of the frequency that these feelings occur, ranging from "never" (0) to "every day" (6).

To make the survey instrument more appropriate to the Pacific region, the MBI Educators Survey (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1986) and the MBI Human Services Survey (Maslach & Jackson, 1986) were adapted, with permission from the publisher. Seven of the 22 items were modified to clarify vocabulary and idiomatic phrases. Since many of the respondents in the Pacific entities speak English as a second or foreign language, words such as "exhilarated" and "callous," or expressions such as "at the end of my rope" were stated in more understandable terms. These modifications were made by two Pacific-entity educators who are familiar with the English proficiency of teachers in the region. It was determined that these language-clarifying changes would not significantly alter the instrument's technical qualities. The MBI has been validated for use in countries around the world in a number of translations (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 1).

Section 3 - Reasons for Leaving the Profession

The purpose of Section 3 was to understand why teachers and school administrators leave their jobs. Respondents were asked to rate each of 19 statements on a four-point Likert-type scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." For example, teachers rated their level of agreement with two statements: "I might leave my current teaching job for a better teaching position within the next two years" and "I might leave teaching altogether within the next two years." They were also asked to rate their agreement by noting reasons why they might quit teaching. Reasons for leaving the profession, as listed on the survey, were selected because of their prevalence in attrition literature. Additional reasons were included on the basis of their perceived importance by educators in the Pacific region.

Procedures

The R&D Cadre members and their local support teams coordinated the survey administration. They planned meetings to inform school staff about the RAPSTA study, its purpose, rationale for the selection of schools, and the importance of serious responses to the survey. In these meetings, schedules for data collection were developed and confirmed. Plans for necessary logistical support and accommodations were also communicated to the staff.

The local support team members and volunteers from the DOE central office visited the schools and met with teachers in a group setting to explain the RAPSTA study. Teachers filled out the questionnaires for collection at the end of the session.

The data were collected from April 1997 to June 1997, giving adequate time for personnel to complete the surveys and time for PREL representatives to follow up on the status of returned surveys. Surveys were collected by the local support team after being completed by each school's teachers and administrators. They were then forwarded to PREL in Honolulu for data entry and preliminary analysis.

An important part of the procedure was the administration of the survey instruments, which were distributed on Yap Proper by an R & D Cadre member, a DOE staff member, and an educational specialist. On the neighboring islands, the surveying procedure was handled by other DOE personnel. At each school, the survey administrator met with teachers to explain the questionnaire and ensure that teachers took their responses to the survey seriously.

III. Findings

This section features general findings on absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout among teachers and school administrators in Yap State. It highlights findings in three areas: (1) reasons for school absences, (2) possible reasons for attrition in the education profession, and (3) comparisons of Potential Leavers with Non-Leavers.

Reasons for School Absences

During the 1996-1997 school year, teachers in Yap State were away from work, on average, a total of 15.08 days. School administrators were away from work, on average, a total of 20.25 days. Table 3 provides data on reasons why teachers were away from work and frequency of absence. Table 4 provides data on reasons why school administrators were away from work and frequency of absence.

Table 3
Reasons Why Teachers Are Away From School in Yap State

Rank	Reason	Average # of Days Away
1	Educational leave	2.75
2	Personal illness	2.19
3	Funerals	1.68
4	Family member sick	1.32
5	Meetings and workshops	1.18
6	Child care	1.14
7	Maternity leave	1.11
8	Storm, heavy rain, flood, etc.	0.98
9	Vacation	0.79
10	Community responsibilities	0.42
11	Family responsibilities	0.28
12	Other	0.18
13	Stress	0.14
14	Lack of instructional materials	0.13
14	Transportation problem	0.13
15	Administrative leave	0.12
15	Training leave	0.12
16	Working conditions	0.11
17	Relationship with supervisors	0.10
18	Suspension	0.08
19	Church activities	0.05
20	Paternity leave	0.03
20	Birthdays	0.03
21	Relationship with co-workers	0.01
21	Weddings	0.01
22	Jury duty	0.00
22	Military training	0.00
	TOTAL	15.08

In Yap State, educational leave was the leading cause of teachers being away from school, with 2.75 days away. The next highest reason was personal illness, with an average of 2.19 days; followed by funerals, with an average of 1.68 days.

Table 4
Reasons Why School Administrators Are Away From School In Yap State

Rank	Reason	Average # of Days Away
1	Meetings and workshops	5.73
2	Family member sick	5.58
3	Personal illness	2.35
4	Educational leave	2.12
5	Funerals	1.62
6	Storm, heavy rain, flood, etc.	0.89
7	Vacation	0.69
8	Family responsibilities	0.54
9	Community responsibilities	0.23
9	Training leave	0.23
10	Administrative leave	0.19
11	Church activities	0.08
12	Birthdays	0.00
12	Child care	0.00
12	Jury duty	0.00
12	Lack of instructional materials	0.00
12	Maternity leave	0.00
12	Military training	0.00
12	Other	0.00
12	Paternity leave	0.00
12	Relationship with co-workers	0.00
12	Relationship with supervisors	0.00
12	Stress	0.00
12	Suspension	0.00
12	Transportation problem	0.00
12	Weddings	0.00
12	Working conditions	0.00
	TOTAL	20.25

The top reasons for Yap State school administrators being away from school were meetings and workshops, with an average of 5.73 days; sickness in the family, with an average of 5.58 days; and personal illness, with an average of 2.35 days.

Reasons for Attrition in the Education Profession

Respondents rated 17 reasons for leaving teaching or administration on a four-point Likert-type scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." In order to judge the technical significance of correlations between responses on each item, this ordinal scale was then collapsed into two categories:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"strongly disagree" and "disagree" were counted as DISAGREE; "strongly agree" and "agree" were counted as AGREE. Percentage of agreement was then calculated for each reason.

In Yap State, 16.93 percent (N=32) of all teachers agreed that they might leave teaching within the next two years. For purposes of analysis, two categories were created: Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers. Non-Leavers are those who disagreed with the statement, "I might leave teaching within the next two years." Table 5 ranks the reasons teachers gave for leaving teaching, comparing Potential Leavers with Non-Leavers.

There are many reasons why Potential Leavers might leave teaching, and these reasons differentiate them from Non-Leavers (see rankings in Table 5). A statistical test (Chi^2) was performed to determine if the response patterns of Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers are different when looking at each possible reason for leaving teaching. Potential Leavers are more likely to leave for the following reasons: too much stress, students' bad attitudes, lack of control over school policies, too many disagreements about how to teach, not enough materials and supplies, low salaries, too many responsibilities, and pressure from the community.

In Yap State, 19.2 percent (N=5) of all school administrators agreed that they might leave educational administration within the next two years (Potential Leavers). Table 6 ranks the reasons school administrators gave for leaving the school administration field, comparing Potential Leavers with Non-Leavers. Non-Leavers are those who disagreed with the statement, "I might leave educational administration altogether within the next two years."

Both Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers have similar rankings for many of the reasons (see rankings in Table 6). A statistical test (Chi^2) was performed to find out if the response patterns of Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers are different when looking at each possible reason for leaving school administration. The only significant difference between the two groups is that Potential Leavers were found to be less likely to leave because of pressure from the community.

Table 5

Reasons for Leaving Teaching in Yap State

If I quit teaching, it would be because of ...		Potential Leavers		Non-Leavers	
		% Agree	Rank	% Agree	Rank
poor working conditions		66.7	6	58.3	6
no support from school administration		72.4	4	62.3	5
no support from central office		75.9	3	63.5	4
too much stress	**	70.0	5	39.8	10
poor relationships with parents		57.1	9	37.7	11
students' bad attitudes	**	62.1	7	27.9	14
my lack of control over school policies	**	62.1	7	26.7	16
poor benefits		59.3	8	48.1	8
personal health problems		55.2	10	68.3	1
too many disagreements about how to teach	**	62.1	7	35.6	13
not enough school materials and supplies	**	82.1	2	50.5	7
low salaries	*	90.0	1	66.7	3
too many responsibilities	**	70.0	5	27.2	15
pressure from the community	**	75.9	3	48.1	8
retirement		51.7	11	67.0	2
promotion		51.7	11	41.5	9
poor relationship with other teachers		44.8	12	36.2	12

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 6

Reasons for Leaving Administration in Yap State

If I quit being a school administrator, it would be because of ...	Potential Leavers		Non-Leavers	
	% Agree	Rank	% Agree	Rank
poor working conditions	66.7	3	50.0	5
no support from school staff	50.0	4	56.3	4
no support from central office administration	50.0	4	50.0	5
too much stress	0.0	8	31.3	9
poor relationships with parents	50.0	4	56.3	4
students' bad attitudes	0.0	8	18.8	12
my lack of control over school policies	0.0	8	12.5	13
poor benefits	20.0	7	37.5	8
personal health problems	80.0	1	56.3	4
too many disagreements about how to run my school	0.0	8	50.0	5
not enough school materials and supplies	25.0	6	25.0	10
low salaries	75.0	2	60.0	3
too many responsibilities	0.0	8	20.0	11
pressure from the community *	0.0	8	62.5	2
retirement	40.0	5	73.3	1
promotion	25.0	6	46.7	6
poor relationship with teachers	0.0	8	43.8	7
poor relationship with staff	0.0	8	43.8	7
political reasons	25.0	6	43.8	7

* $p \leq .05$

Comparison of Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers

The relationship between stress, burnout, and reported desire to leave education was examined in order to provide assistance to program managers and staff developers who work to improve school climate.

1. A *high degree of burnout* is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion, and Depersonalization subscales, and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale.

2. A *medium degree of burnout* is reflected in average scores on the three subscales.

3. A *low degree of burnout* is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales, and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale.

Table 7 reflects a comparison of mean scores for all teacher and school administrator respondents, with scores from the norm sample. These scores indicate that Yap State teachers' sense of personal accomplishment is about the same as the norm sample. However, they are less emotionally exhausted and do not feel as depersonalized as those in the norm group.

School administrators exhibit a lower sense of personal accomplishment, less emotional exhaustion, and less depersonalization than both the norm sample and the Yap teacher sample.

Table 7

MBI Subscale Mean Scores for Yap State Teachers and School Administrators Compared to the Norm Sample

MBI Subscale	Sample Size	Mean Score
Personal Accomplishment (PA)		
Yap State Teachers	189	33.2
Yap State School Administrators	26	31.8
Norm Sample	4,163	33.5
Emotional Exhaustion (EE)		
Yap State Teachers	189	16.5
Yap State School Administrators	26	16.1
Norm Sample	4,163	21.3
Depersonalization (DP)		
Yap State Teachers	189	5.5
Yap State School Administrators	26	4.8
Norm Sample	4,163	11.0

In order to analyze how Potential Leavers compare to Non-Leavers on the MBI subscales, scores were classified into High, Moderate, and Low categories. To make interpretation easier, the suggested cut-off scores used by MBI authors to classify low and high Personal Accomplishment were reversed. That is, a high score in this report means a high sense of personal accomplishment. According to the authors (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996), personal accomplishment is a reverse scale, which means high scores denote a high lack of personal accomplishment. We found this to be confusing and, thus, made these changes for our reporting purposes. The following cut-off scores were used:

Table 8
Cut-Off Scores for MBI Subscale Categories

MBI Subscale	High	Moderate	Low
Personal Accomplishment	≥ 37	31-36	≤ 30
Emotional Exhaustion	≥ 27	17-26	≤ 16
Depersonalization	≥ 14	9-13	≤ 8

Figures 1-6 display differences between Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers among teachers (Figures 1-3) and school administrators (Figures 4-6) on the three MBI subscales. Teachers who might leave have a lower sense of personal accomplishment, are more emotionally exhausted, and feel more depersonalized than those who do not plan to leave.

On the other hand, school administrators who might leave experience a higher sense of personal accomplishment, are less emotionally exhausted, and feel less depersonalized than those who do not plan to leave.



Figure 1. **Personal accomplishment among teachers in Yap State**



Figure 2. **Emotional exhaustion among teachers in Yap State**



Figure 3. **Depersonalization among teachers in Yap State**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Figure 4. **Personal accomplishment among school administrators in Yap State**



Figure 5. **Emotional exhaustion among school administrators in Yap State**



Figure 6. **Depersonalization among school administrators in Yap State**

IV. Discussion

Absenteeism

Absenteeism among teachers and school administrators in Yap State appears to be a problem. For example, teachers were away from work, on average, a total of 15.08 days. School administrators were away from work, on average, a total of 20.25 days. These rates of absenteeism are among the highest in the region. Absences for teachers and school administrators are due to many reasons, including personal illness and funerals, which were cited by Scott & Wimbush (1991) as immediate obligations or concerns. However, the most common reasons why teachers and school administrators are away from school include educational leave, and meetings and workshops. Although these could be considered valid reasons, the high absenteeism rates for both teachers and school administrators are problematic.

Attrition

Among teachers in Yap State, there are more differentiating reasons for Potential Leavers to leave teaching than there are for school administrators to leave school administration. Many of these reasons—low salaries, not enough school supplies and materials, too many responsibilities—are similar to those identified by Wari (1993) as chronic or habitual concerns associated with attrition.

For school administrators, less than the expected number of respondents leave due to pressure from the community. This implies that community pressure will not be a reason for school administrators to leave within the next two years. Their reasons for

leaving cannot be determined from this analysis.

Burnout

In Yap State, teachers who might leave within the next two years are experiencing more burnout than those who plan to stay. These teachers (Potential Leavers) exhibit a lower level of personal accomplishment, and higher levels of emotional exhaustion and feelings of depersonalization than their non-leaving counterparts. Occupational burnout for Yap State teachers appears to be a factor that might cause them to leave teaching. Reasons that differentiate Potential Leavers from Non-Leavers include students' bad attitudes, lack of control over school policies, too many disagreements about how to teach, and pressure from the community.

School administrators in Yap State do not appear to experience occupational burnout. Yap school administrators who plan to leave (Potential Leavers) are less emotionally exhausted, feel less depersonalized, and have a higher sense of personal accomplishment than those who plan to stay. These unexpected results raise questions that might warrant further investigation.

V. Limitations

The Challenge of Language and Culture

Conducting research across diverse linguistic and cultural groups is a challenging task. The language in which research is conducted can limit accurate interpretation of results. Expectations regarding task importance and response candor may vary from culture to culture. Thus, results from cross-cultural studies may be difficult to interpret.

While English is the language of wider communication in all of the American-affiliated Pacific entities, respondents to the surveys in this study varied in their use and comprehension of English. For some, English might be a first language; for others, it might be a second or third language, used to a much lesser extent than the vernacular. Thus, particular vocabulary, grammatical structures, or instructions may have been problematic.

To adjust for some for these potential errors in measurement, native language/culture informants, who are members of the R&D Cadre or entity local support teams, provided the following expert assistance:

- developed and piloted questions used in the survey;
- revised potentially confusing items from the Maslach instrument;
- in many cases, administered surveys in group settings, leading respondents through each item, and clarifying meanings upon request; and
- provided translations, where necessary, especially in geographically isolated outer-island settings.

Culture-specific interpretations concerning the importance of research, ways of responding, and the meanings of specific terms might all affect results. R&D Cadre members made special efforts to work with their respective departments or ministries of education and directors to ensure that teachers and school administrators took their responses to the survey seriously. In many cases, entity-wide meetings were held to explain the study, its importance, and the need for truthful data. Because the study was designed by members of each department of education, and was intended to investigate issues of importance to the entity, some support was ensured. The study was discussed at principals' and teachers' meetings; support for administration and data collection was provided by the entity department or ministry of education.

Instrumentation

All data collected in this study came from self-report questionnaires. This method of data collection was selected because of its perceived advantages for large-scale research. Those advantages include:

- Questionnaires are relatively easy and inexpensive to administer
- Questionnaires can be designed to ensure anonymity
- Respondents answer at their own pace
- Questions are standardized

However, self-report questionnaires also have limitations—responses may not always be truthful or accurate. Some respondents might make careless errors, such as checking the wrong box or writing the incorrect number. They might purposely answer questions with incorrect information because they want to give a favorable impression or avoid potentially embarrassing admissions. Or, they might misinterpret questions and respond inaccurately.

The R&D Cadre pilot-tested the questionnaires in order to improve wording so that respondents might better interpret the meanings of questions. Additionally, directions for completing the questionnaires and administration procedures were purposefully designed to ensure anonymity. However, even with these precautions, hindsight tells us that specific changes might have improved the validity of responses. In particular, the following limitations are noted:

1. Items that required respondents to check boxes on the right were somewhat confusing. The items should have been transposed so that the boxes were on the left.
2. Questions measuring attrition could have been phrased with greater clarity. Rather than asking if the respondents *might* leave and reasons that *might* cause them to leave, perhaps asking whether or not they were *going* to leave and *why* would have provided more definitive information.
3. In order to assure respondents of anonymity and foster truthfulness in responses, surveys did not ask for individuals' names. However, they did request the names of schools. In entities where there are few schools and a limited number of teachers (e.g., one per grade level), this may not have been sufficient to guarantee anonymity, and, consequently, honesty in response.

Analysis

Non-responses to items on the questionnaires could limit the validity of some results. For example, in order to analyze differences between teachers who are Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers, only those who responded to the question "I might leave teaching within the next two years" and each of the reasons for leaving could be included in the analyses (cross-tabulations). In some instances, large portions of the sample did not respond to either the "I might leave" question or one of the reasons.

Therefore, conclusions based on such results may only be generalized on the basis of those who were willing to respond. There may be systematic differences between respondents and non-respondents. For example, if non-respondents were more likely to experience depersonalization at work and, therefore, did not care to respond to all items, then conclusions based on results in which they did not participate would under-identify this risk factor in the population.

Although standardized group administration practices included requests to respond to all items, these requests were not sufficient. Moreover, standardized administration was not always possible.

Non-responses on the Maslach Burnout Inventory were also a problem. In order to calculate each subscale score, all items that contributed to that subscale must have been answered. If a respondent left one item out, the subscale in which that item was included could not be computed. Therefore, the extent of burnout may be underrepresented.

VI. Recommendations

The recommendations provided in this section of the report are based on the general findings concerned with absenteeism, attrition, and stress/burnout among teachers and school administrators in Yap State. Findings in three areas are highlighted: (1) reasons for absences, (2) possible reasons for attrition in the education profession, and (3) comparisons of Potential Leavers and Non-Leavers.

Recommendations Regarding Findings on Absenteeism

The absenteeism rates for teachers and school administrators in Yap State are among the highest of the Pacific entities in this study. Absences for teachers and school administrators were due to a wide range of reasons; the most prevalent were educational leave, and meetings and workshops. It is recommended that serious attention be given to improving the school attendance of Pacific educators in Yap State. Existing policies on attendance should be reviewed for appropriate action. In the absence of policies on attendance, written policies should be developed and consistently implemented. Special attention should be given to policies dealing with educational leave for school personnel during the school year.

Recommendations Regarding Findings on Attrition

1. In Yap State, there are numerous reasons for teachers to leave the teaching profession. Habitual concerns, such as low salaries and stress-related factors, may cause teachers in Yap State to leave. To reduce the teacher attrition rate, it is recommended that a proactive program focused on stress management be designed and implemented by the department. Staff stability, in turn, could contribute to better student performance and achievement.

2. Future research will be needed to identify reasons why school administrators choose to leave school administration in Yap State.

Recommendations Regarding Findings on Stress/Burnout

Occupational burnout appears to be a problem for teachers in Yap State. To reduce stress and burnout among teachers, it is recommended that a comprehensive program be developed and implemented. Such a program may contribute to improved attendance and well-being of those who work most closely with students.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Cochran, W. G. (1954). Some methods for strengthening the common X^2 tests. *Biometrics, 10*, 417-451.

DeRobbio, R. A. (1995). *Factors accounting for burnout among secondary school teachers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

DeRobbio, R. A. & Iwanicki, E. (1996, April). *Factors accounting for burnout among secondary school teachers.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Farber, B. & Ascher, C. (1992). *Urban school restructuring and teacher burnout.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC/CUE Digest Number 75). [Online]. Available: http://ericweb.tc.columbia.edu/digests/dig75.html [1998, April].

Hammond, O. & Onikama, D. (1997). *At risk teachers.* Honolulu, HI: Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

Holmes, T. H. & Rahe R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11*, 213-218.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S., & Schwab, L. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (9th ed.). (1997). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Offerman, L. R. (1986). Maslach Burnout Inventory. In E. Keyser & R. Sweetland (Eds.), *Test Critiques, volume III* (pp. 419 – 426). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Pacific Region Educational Laboratory R & D Cadre. (1995). *A study of risk factors among high school students in the Pacific region.* Honolulu, HI: Pacific Region Educational Laboratory.

Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. (1996). *Annual report.* Honolulu, HI: Author.

Pelletier, K. R. (1977). *Mind as healer, mind as slayer.* New York, NY: Dell.

Scott, K. D. & Wimbush, J. (1991). Teacher absenteeism in secondary education. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27* (4), 506-529.

Wari, P. (1993). Teacher wastage: The extent and causes. *Papua New Guinea Journal of Education, 29* (2), 69-84.

Appendices

Appendix A: RAPSTA Teacher Questionnaire

Appendix B: RAPSTA School Administrator Questionnaire

Appendix A

Retention and Attrition of Pacific School Teachers and Administrators (RAPSTA) Study

---

Teacher Questionnaire

Created by the

Research and Development Cadre

American Samoa Department of Education
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Public School System
Federated States of Micronesia National Department of Education
Guam Department of Education
Chuuk State Department of Education
Hawai'i State Department of Education
Kosrae State Department of Education
Pohnpei State Department of Education
Yap State Department of Education
Republic of the Marshall Islands Ministry of Education
Republic of Palau Ministry of Education
with the assistance of
Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

PREL

Retention and Attrition of Pacific School Teachers and Administrators (RAPSTA) Study
Teacher Questionnaire

SECTION 1

The purpose of this section is to understand what factors cause teachers to be away from school. All responses will be kept anonymous. Please complete this section by filling in the requested information. Please print your responses and check (✓) boxes () as appropriate. Remember, DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. It is important that all responses be anonymous.

School:_____ **Date**: _____

Location: Am. Samoa Guam CNMI Hawai`i RMI
Pohnpei Chuuk Kosrae Yap Palau

Gender: M F **Place of birth:** _____
(Entity or State or Country)

Ethnic heritage: _____
(Ethnicity of Parents)

Age:
15-19 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44
45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65 +

Current marital status:
Never Married Married Separated Divorced Widowed

Highest level of education attained:
High School Graduate Associate Degree Bachelor Degree
Master Degree Other (specify)

Major field of study: _____
(Examples: Elementary Education, Math, Science, Agriculture, etc.)

Current annual salary: $_____(per year)

Years of teaching experience:
1 - 4 5 - 10 11 - 14 15 - 20 21 or more

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
What grades do you currently teach? (check all that apply)													
How many students do you teach? (put in number per grade level)													

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For elementary teachers who teach in self-contained settings, please check the subject areas you are currently teaching.

✓	Subject areas you teach (put a ✓ in column on left)	✓	Subject areas you teach (put a ✓ in column on left)
	Language Arts/English		Art
	Language Arts/Vernacular		Music
	Math		Health
	Science		Physical Education
	Social Studies		Guidance
	Other (specify)		Other (specify)

For secondary teachers who teach in departmentalized settings, please check the subject area(s) and number of class periods you are currently teaching.

	Number of class periods you teach (put a ✓ in the appropriate columns)						
Subject area(s) you teach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Language Arts/English							
Language Arts/Vernacular							
Math							
Science							
Social Studies							
Vocational Education (specify)							
Business Education							
Computers							
Art							
Music							
Physical Education							
Other (specify)							

If you have had jobs other than teaching, please list them below.

Previous employment other than teaching	Number of years

Total number of instructional days you were away from school this year (SY '96 -'97):

None 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 20 +

Write the number of days you were away from school in SY '96 -'97 for the reasons listed below.

Reason	Number of Days	Reason	Number of Days
funerals		working conditions	
birthdays		relationship with co-workers	
child care		stress	
transportation problem		meetings and workshops	
personal illness		administrative leave	
family member sick		educational leave	
family responsibilities (errands)		training leave	
community responsibilities		church activities	
storm, heavy rain or flood		maternity leave	
vacation		paternity leave	
lack of instructional materials		suspension	
relationship with supervisor		jury duty	
wedding		military training	
other (specify)		other (specify)	

SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire contained directions and 22 items intended to measure teachers' stress and burnout. This section was modified and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA 94303 from ***Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey*** *by Christina Maslach, Susan E. Jackson, & Richard L. Schwab. Copyright 1986 by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. Permission for reproduction of the instrument in this report was not granted.*

SECTION 3

The purpose of this section is to understand what makes teachers leave their jobs. Below are listed statements made about quitting a teaching job. Place a check (✓) in the column next to each statement that best reflects how much *you agree or disagree* with the statement. Please respond to all statements.

MAKE ONE ✓ MARK ON EACH LINE.

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I might leave my current teaching job for a better teaching position within the next two years.				
I might leave teaching all together within the next two years.				
If I quit teaching, it would be because of . . .				
poor working conditions.				
no support from school administration.				
no support from central office administration.				
too much stress.				
poor relationships with parents.				
students' bad attitudes.				
my lack of control over school policies.				
poor benefits (health insurance, retirement, etc.).				
personal health problems.				
too many disagreements about how to teach.				
not enough school materials and supplies.				
low salaries.				
too many responsibilities.				
pressure from the community.				
retirement.				
promotion.				
poor relationship with other teachers.				

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this questionnaire to the large envelope which has been placed on one of the desks in the room.

Appendix B

Retention and Attrition of
Pacific School Teachers and Administrators
(RAPSTA) Study

School Administrator Questionnaire

Created by the

Research and Development Cadre

American Samoa Department of Education
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Public School System
Federated States of Micronesia National Department of Education
Guam Department of Education
Chuuk State Department of Education
Hawai'i State Department of Education
Kosrae State Department of Education
Pohnpei State Department of Education
Yap State Department of Education
Republic of the Marshall Islands Ministry of Education
Republic of Palau Ministry of Education
with the assistance of
Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

Retention and Attrition of Pacific School Teachers and Administrators
(RAPSTA) Study
School Administrator Questionnaire

SECTION 1

The purpose of this section is to understand what factors cause school administrators to be away from school. All responses will be kept anonymous. Please complete this section by filling in the requested information. Please print your responses and check (✓) boxes () as appropriate. Remember, DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONAIRE. It is important that all responses be anonymous.

Date: _____

Location: Am. Samoa Guam CNMI Hawai`i RMI
Pohnpei Chuuk Kosrae Yap Palau

Gender: M F **Place of birth:** _____
(Entity or State or Country)

Ethnic heritage: _____
(Ethnicity of Parents)

Age:
15-19 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44
45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65 +

Current marital status:
Never Married Married Separated Divorced Widowed

Highest level of education attained:
High School Graduate Associate Degree Bachelor Degree
Master Degree Other (specify)

Major field(s) of study: _____
(Examples: School Administration, Curriculum & Instruction, Elementary Education, Math, etc.)

Current annual salary: $_____(per year)

Total school enrollment: _____

Students enrolled by grade:
What is the student enrollment at your school by grade?

K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Your current position:
principal vice-principal head teacher
teaching principal teaching vice-principal

In the space below, please describe your training in school administration.

Please indicate the number of years of teaching and administrative experience you have had.

	Number of years by level		
	Elem./Int. (K-8)	High Sch. (9-12)	College
teacher			
head teacher			
teaching department head			
teaching vice-principal			
vice-principal			
teaching principal			
principal			

If you are a teaching principal/teaching vice-principal, please check the subject area(s) and number of class periods you are currently teaching.

	Number of class periods you teach (put a ✓ in the appropriate columns)						
Subject area(s) you teach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Language Arts/English							
Language Arts/Vernacular							
Math							
Science							
Social Studies							
Vocational Education (specify)							
Business Education							
Computers							
Art							
Music							
Physical Education							
Other (specify)							

If you have had jobs other than teaching and/or school administration, please list them below.

Previous employment other than teaching or school administration	Number of years

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Total number of days you were away from school in SY '96 -'97:

None 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 20 +

Write the number of days you were away from school in SY '96 -'97 for the reasons listed below.

Reason	Number of Days	Reason	Number of Days
funerals		working conditions	
birthdays		relationship with co-workers	
child care		stress	
transportation problem		meetings and workshops	
personal illness		administrative leave	
family member sick		educational leave	
family responsibilities (errands)		training leave	
community responsibilities		church activities	
storm, heavy rain or flood		maternity leave	
vacation		paternity leave	
lack of instructional materials		suspension	
relationship with supervisor		jury duty	
wedding		military training	
other (specify)		other (specify)	

SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire contained directions and 22 items intended to measure school administrators' stress and burnout. This section was modified and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA 94303 from ***Maslach Burnout Inventory–Human Services Survey*** *by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson. Copyright 1986 by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. Permission for reproduction of the instrument in this report was not granted.*

SECTION 3

The purpose of this section is to understand what makes school administrators leave their jobs. Below are listed statements made about quitting a school administrator's job. Place a check (✓) in the column next to each statement that best reflects how much *you agree or disagree* with the statement.

MAKE ONE ✓ MARK ON EACH LINE.

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I might leave my current school administrator position for a better school administrator position within the next two years.				
I might leave my current school administrator position for a better central office administrator position within the next two years.				
I might leave educational administration all together within the next two years.				

If I quit teaching, it would be because of . . .

poor working conditions.	
no support from school administration.	
no support from central office administration.	✓
too much stress.	
poor relationships with parents.	
students' bad attitudes.	
my lack of control over school policies.	
poor benefits (health insurance, retirement, etc.).	
personal health problems.	
too many disagreements about how to teach.	
not enough school materials and supplies.	
low salaries.	
too many responsibilities.	
pressure from the community.	
retirement.	
promotion.	
poor relationship with other teachers.	
political reasons.	

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this questionnaire to the large envelope which has been placed on one of the desks in the room.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PACIFIC RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING
828 Fort Street Mall • Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813-4321
Tel: (808) 533-6000
e-mail: askprel@prel.hawaii.edu
WEBsite: http://www.prel.hawaii.edu

American Samoa
P.O. Box 186
Pago Pago, AS 96799

Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Suite 203, Bank of Hawai'i Building
Marina Heights Business Park
PPP 145 • Box 10000
Puerto Rico, Saipan, MP 96950
Tel: (670) 323-6000 • FAX: (670) 323-7735
e-mail: prelwest@prel.hawaii.edu

Yap, Federated States of Micronesia
P.O. Box 985
Colonia, Yap FM 96943
Tel: (691) 350-4382 • FAX: (691) 350-4380
e-mail: yap@prel.hawaii.edu

RS9804

BEST COPY AVAILABLE